

4 important that we comment or analyze that. And
5 that's part of the IR process. Anything you can
6 give us on that would be very helpful.

7 Financially one of the other issues that we
8 need to get your written comments on, and that would
9 be helpful in making the final decisions concerning
10 the other alternatives for dealing for servicing the
11 Antelope Valley, and why those other alternatives
12 are inadequate.

13 As you know, high-speed rail was sort of
14 designed to be really a big urban transportation
15 system and not a local -- that's not saying whether
16 this is or is not a local --

17 MR. BOB SCHAEVITZ: Yes.

18 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Not a local commuter
19 system because, obviously, then it's no longer high
20 speed. It gets -- but in the Antelope Valley is
21 relatively far from downtown L.A.

22 While the other alternative transportation
23 systems don't work, we have in the bond act there's
24 a billion dollars. One of the most important thing
25 on high-speed rail to make it work is have all the

26 regional transportation systems connecting to a hub.
27 And there's a billion dollars in the current bond
28 act that there will be more, obviously, because the
29 initial cost is double that.

30 It could be used for improving the Metrolink
31 system up to, not high-speed, but chose to
32 high-speed. And what is good or bad of that
33 vis-a-vis what you need.

34 That would be helpful because, again, the
35 analysts are going to look at the facts as they see
36 it. I may be persuaded because there's many, many
37 positive reasons for going to Palmdale.

38 But we need to have those factual issues
39 presented to us so that we can evaluate them in the
40 best way.

41 MR. BOB SCHAEVITZ: We will be making an
42 extensive written submittal to you and all your
43 issues. We will make sure they're addressed up
44 front.

45 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: I'm going to make a
46 plea. We are, in many ways, financially strapped
47 for this particular. So anything that you can give
48 us in terms of facts will be more helpful than you
49 can possibly imagine.

50 MR. BOB SCHAEVITZ: We will be happy to do
51 what we can. And Tom will talk about more specific
52 issues in the EIR.

53 -TESTIMONY-

54 BY MR. THOMAS HOLM (PHONETIC): Thank you,
55 Bob.

56 Chairman Petrillo, I'm Thomas Home,
57 environmental services director in Irvine.

PH-LA1010-1

PH-LA1010

9 Our environmental team reviewed the EIR is
10 well under way at this point. I would like to
11 highlight categories of where we agreed with
12 conclusions in the EIR, and come back to issue areas
13 that we're studying closely and will be formulating
14 written comments for you at a later date.

15 Categories where the EIR indicates that the
16 Antelope Valley alignment is a superior alternative
17 and ultimately the best choice for the environment
18 include travel conditions, air quality,
19 growth-induced impacts, farmland, parks and
20 recreation, hydrology and water resources, wetlands,
21 and sensitive plant communities.

22 Next slide, please.

23 The EIR indicates, on the whole, the
24 Antelope Valley alignment is superior with regard to
25 travel conditions, provides access to a growing

0054

1 Antelope Valley population base.

2 It promotes intermodal connectivity with bus
3 service, Metrolink, and the next major regional
4 airport at Palmdale.

5 The EIR indicates that regional vehicle
6 miles traveled are reduced with the Antelope Valley
7 alignment. Affording some potentially significant
8 air quality benefits.

9 Surprisingly, though, the EIR does not
10 address alignment differences for air quality, or
11 quantify those differences with respect to the
12 alternative alignments. We believe that further
13 studies would demonstrate clearly that the AV
14 alignment results in regional air quality benefits
15 from reduced traffic congestion.

16 Next slide, please.

17 With regard to close impacts, the EIR
18 indicates that the Antelope Valley alignment
19 concentrates growth in Los Angeles County, largely
20 in areas where such growth is already anticipated to
21 occur.

22 It indicates that there will be a possible
23 net reduction in new urbanized land requirements
24 statewide.

25 With regard to farmlands, the EIR draws a

0055

1 clear distinction between the two alignments. The
2 Antelope Valley alignment results in no direct loss
3 of prior or unique farmlands.

4 It also reduces farmland conversion as
5 compared to the I-5 Grapevine. The AV route is the
6 route with the least potential impacts to farmlands.

7 Next slide.

8 The I-5 Grapevine alignment potentially
9 impacts the Los Angeles National Forest, Pyramid
10 Lake and the state vehicular recreation area. The
11 Antelope Valley alignment avoids major parks in the
12 Angeles National Forest, and avoids the most
13 significant historical resources in the Bakersfield

PH-LA1010-I
cont

14 and Sylmar segment.

15 The EIR indicates the Antelope Valley
16 alignment avoids impacts to major streams and lakes,
17 and minimizes impacts with regard to the other
18 alternatives to flood planes.

19 Next slide.

20 There's a number of environmental categories
21 where one would anticipate that almost any alignment
22 through a populated area would result in measurable
23 effects. These include noise and vibration, land
24 use, and planning considerations, environmental
25 justice concerns.

0056

1 Our review to date indicates that there
2 appear to be no substantial differences identified
3 in the EIR for the two alignments.

4 Finally, there's several EIR sections and
5 technical studies that we are still reviewing where
6 additional information is needed, and our review is
7 focusing on survey methods and study assumptions,
8 and these categories include biological resources,
9 cultural resources, aesthetics, and visual quality.

10 The public review period extension that was
11 granted by the authority is appreciated. And it was
12 needed for us to be able to complete our review and
13 formulate comments on the EIR methods and
14 conclusions and provide those to you in a written
15 format that would be of use to you.

16 With that, I would like to turn our
17 presentation back to Mayor --

18 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Just a comment that
19 would be help us, for us to remind everyone that
20 the -- again, the economic impact of different route
21 choices is part of the consideration because the
22 overriding potential in adopting the environmental
23 impact reports.

24 So it's important that you get us
25 information on that so that we can fully evaluate

0057

1 that.

2 The second thing, even on the biological
3 culture and aesthetics, I would appreciate in your
4 comments, we are doing sort of not a foot-by-foot
5 analysis, so if you can focus on what it is that
6 we're missing in gross in terms of the analysis,
7 that would be helpful in having our analysts look at
8 that.

9 MR. THOMAS HOLM: We appreciate that, and
10 will take the system alternatives comparison into
11 account in our comments for you.

12 Thank you.

13 HON. JIM LEDFORD: At this time I would like
14 to introduce Professor Montabe for his presentation.

15

16

-TESTIMONY-

PH-LA1011

BY PROFESSOR ASHRAN MONTABE (PHONETIC):

PH-LA1010-1
cont

18 Mr. Chairman and members of the board, my name is

19 Ashran Montabe (phonetic). I'm a consultant with
20 one of the two companies in the study for the City
21 of Palmdale.

22 The -- I have a background in mining and
23 engineering, and I graduated from the University of
24 California at Berkeley in civil engineering. And I
25 have taught at Columbia University for eight years,
0058

1 and I worked for the U.S. Bureau of Mines.

2 So my experience is really in construction
3 underground, and recently the last ten years or so
4 focused on tunnels.

5 This first figure or map that I'm putting on
6 the screen is -- gives not only the two alignments,
7 the AV and I-5, but also shows, in yellow, the
8 tunnels which are going to be used for completing
9 these alignments.

10 In the red dashed lines there are these
11 faults. Unfortunately all this area is so cluttered
12 with faults that they become one of the most
13 problematic locations in driving tunnels.

14 If a fault -- if a tunnel crosses a fault in
15 a particular direction, then it's the shortest
16 contact. But if a fault is parallel to the
17 direction of the tunnel, whether the fault is active
18 or not, it still has a significant effect, the
19 ground conditions.

20 Over time the fault may slip not because of
21 an earthquake, but because there's a slippage in the
22 order of several millimeters per year. And that
23 slippage --

24 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Excuse me. Do I
25 understand what you are saying is that it is better
0059

1 to cross the faults at 90-degree angles than
2 parallel?

3 PROFESSOR MONTABE: It's better to cross the
4 fault at 90 degrees as possible. But not all
5 alignments will allow this kind of crossing.

6 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: And the reason that is
7 superior is? The reason why that is superior?

8 PROFESSOR MONTABE: Is because the contact
9 with the fault by crossing is minimized.

10 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Okay.

11 PROFESSOR MONTABE: If you look at the
12 beginning of these two alignments, you will
13 encounter the Santa Susana and Sierra Madre fault,
14 and the I-5 is not crossing perpendicular, but the
15 AV is crossing more or less perpendicular to the
16 fault.

17 Then we can come to this region, this
18 triangle, which forms the crossing of two of the
19 major faults. San Andreas and Carlock (phonetic),

20 and there may be some difficulties.

PH-LA1011-1
cont

21 We don't have enough information now. As I
22 will show you in the results later, the lack of
23 information also gives a very large spread in the
24 results.

25 Now we talk about the methodology used for
0060

1 the analysis. There's a tool developed at MIT.
2 Professor Einstein is the originator of this tool.
3 It's called DAT, or Decision Aids for Tunneling.

4 This tool was developed with the help of
5 some assistance from polytechnicians primarily in
6 Los Angeles and in Switzerland. And then it was
7 applied to projects all around the world by GeoData,
8 including projects which are high-speed rail.

9 For instance, whether Amma or Baharris in
10 Spain, and Leon Touring high-speed rail (phonetic),
11 and in addition, this analysis has been applied to
12 several metro projects in Milan.

13 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Just to clarify,
14 again, are you saying that this is the process for
15 analyzing tunneling, and it hasn't or has not -- it
16 has or has not been applied here, and it should or
17 should not be applied here?

18 PROFESSOR MONTABE: The methodology which
19 I'm describing is the methodology that applied in
20 the report commissioned by Palmdale. And the
21 results arrived from this method.

22 I'm trying to mention that this application
23 has an experience of about 20 years total, and for
24 GeoData, it is an experience of at least 12 years.
25 And based on --

0061

1 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: So this is -- even
2 though our analyst, this is the conventional process
3 that should be used independent of what we might
4 have come up with, but that procedure is the
5 procedure?

6 PROFESSOR MONTABE: That procedure is now
7 well documented, used on many projects around the
8 world, for selecting an optimum alignment in a given
9 situation.

10 So the process, the decision aids for
11 tunneling uses two specific sets of variables. One
12 of them concerns the geologic, geotechnical
13 conditions, the ground conditions, which includes
14 strength and deformation.

15 Potential instability conditions,
16 problematic water flow, presence of gas, and --
17 rift, which is connected in performance with the
18 tunnel boring machine.

19 These are the parameters which should be
20 considered on a problematic basis. And then there
21 are the parameters which --

22 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Excuse me. I hate to
23 keep breaking in, but this is highly technical, and
24 I need to understand it.

25 Is this what should be part of the analysis

PH-LA1011-1
cont

0062

1 as to, in general, where the tunnels go or the
2 specific tunnel design?

3 PROFESSOR MONTABE: In any specific tunnel
4 design, all of these characteristics or parameters
5 should be used because without looking at these
6 parameters, first of all, you cannot make a design
7 to suit the ground conditions.

8 And secondly, when you talk about the
9 construction parameters, you cannot estimate the
10 speed of which we're going to drive the tunnel, and
11 the cost which is going to be incurred.

12 So both the geological variables and
13 construction parameters together give you the
14 duration of the project and the time and the cost.
15 And as we go down, we will come to that point that
16 we develop two items.

17 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Is your general
18 conclusion that either route is inadequately
19 analyzed?

20 PROFESSOR MONTABE: We used the information
21 which was available, and this information was
22 obtained from the United States Geological Survey,
23 the maps, the geology, hydrology, et cetera.

24 However, one of the conclusions is that
25 there had been further investigation. And I will

0063

1 show you in the last couple of slides why this
2 conclusion is true. The need for additional
3 investigation is prominent, and that's a definite
4 conclusion.

5 So if you go to the construction variables,
6 first of all, we have to select the type or category
7 of construction.

8 Is it going to be done by the tunnel boring
9 machine? Or is it going to be the conventional
10 rhythm blast? Or is it going to be with chambers or
11 shafts?

12 Then we, as well, to take all -- of these
13 conditions are related to cost and adverse
14 conditions, flow of water in certain ground
15 conditions, and instability phenomenon, and the
16 rehabilitation cost and time for correcting the
17 instability situation.

18 The program data then does a simulation. In
19 the simulation, it selects -- first of all, it
20 divides the old route in segments of zone which have
21 homogeneous conditions, then it selects ground
22 parameters, and then it selects time and cost state,
23 and then it determines the overall cost and time,
24 and that is one simulation.

25 And you perform 1,000 simulations.

0064

1 Fortunately it's done by computer. And the result
2 is the scatter diagram or a cloud, as Professor
3 Einstein called it.

4 And in this cloud, you can imagine -- I will

PH-LA1011-1
cont

5 give you a table which gives mean values. From the
6 cloud itself, you see the mean value for the time
7 frame which is -- the horizontal access is 7.4 years
8 for the I-5 alignment at 3.5 percent grade. And the
9 cost, the mean cost is \$1.7 billion.

10 Now, if you go for the analysis of the AV
11 alignment, we obtain this situation. The mean time
12 for completing all the tunnels is 3.7 years, which
13 is half the time for the I-5. And the mean cost is
14 1.1 billion, which is about 600 million less than
15 the I-5.

16 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Just to understand
17 what you are saying is that the analysis in the
18 environmental impact report between the two is
19 inadequate in terms of both costs and time to
20 develop.

21 Is that what you are --

22 PROFESSOR MONTABE: It depends on whether
23 the analyses were done in this manner where you
24 considered all variables and all the design
25 features. I don't know.

0065

1 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: In your written
2 comments, you will identify all of these variables
3 that should have been taken into consideration?

4 PROFESSOR MONTABE: The variables are all
5 identified in this board, which is a hundred-page
6 document.

7 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Which? The
8 Environmental Impact Report?

9 PROFESSOR MONTABE: No. This is the report
10 which was done for the City of Palmdale.

11 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: So you will be
12 submitting that as a written report?

13 PROFESSOR MONTABE: Yes. I don't know if
14 you have a copy of that yet.

15 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: It would be our
16 consultants which have a copy. That's fine.

17 PROFESSOR MONTABE: Now, if we superimpose
18 the two analyses for the I-5 and the AV, then we can
19 see the difference right away.

20 First of all, we notice that the scatter in
21 the cloud for the I-5, and that scatter indicates
22 there was not sufficient information to narrow down
23 around the mean value.

24 And it also indicates that the situation is
25 problematic for defining the exact properties of the

0066

1 fault zone and other material of the ground.

2 And in contrast, the results of the AV, the
3 cloud is thin and more precise, but this is -- the
4 difference in the time, as indicated before, is 3.7
5 years difference. In the time. The time being
6 longer for I-5.

7 And in cost, there's a difference of
8 600 million. I will show you the same figures in
9 the table which gives further information.

PH-LA1011-1
cont

10 We can look at the mean value of the time
11 for the two alignments, I-5 and AV. And we
12 translate it into number of years; 7.4 years for
13 I-5, and 3.7 and a half for AV.

14 Then we can look at the cost. The cost is
15 in billions; 1.7 billion for the I-5, 1.1 billion
16 for the AV, and which is a savings of 600 million.
17 And there's a report from SSR, estimate, which is
18 very close to this. It's 770 million.

19 Also the spread. I will just use this
20 figure for the spread. The difference between the
21 95 percent value, which is 95 percent confident
22 which brings us close to the maximum and the mean
23 value for the cost, is approximately \$254 million
24 for the I-5.

25 And for the AV it's much less. 22 million.

0067

1 Which means that the data itself, the range of the
2 data is too large that you are bound to get this
3 scatter.

4 In conclusion, the first thing is the risks
5 which are involved in dealing with the faults.

6 If you go parallel to the fault and you
7 stay -- if you stay parallel to the fault you are
8 risking, first of all, to going into ground which
9 may generate some problems.

10 And secondly, over time, the maintenance of
11 the tunnels will be costly, and some of these faults
12 move -- will move if there's an earthquake, and
13 there are indications that there's some faults which

14 are active.

15 For instance, this fault is active, and
16 San Andreas, of course, is active. There's some
17 indication that Santa Susana is active.

18 If a fault is active, there will be a shift,
19 and if we know beforehand, we can construct a
20 chamber so if the shift occurs we can adjust the
21 tracks.

22 But if the fault, as I mentioned, is not
23 known to be active, it's not a given, basically, but
24 the tunnels are going parallel to it, they're going
25 in the ground which is already being disturbed.

0068

1 It's a fault zone.

2 Then we have the problem of, first of all,
3 slippage over time, the plastic movement. And
4 second of all, if an earthquake occurs, it will be a
5 much bigger problem and damage, source of damage.

6 So this, I thank you members.

7 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

8

9

-TESTIMONY (Continued)-

PH-LA1012

10 BY HON. JIM LEDFORD: Thank you, Professor
11 Montabe.

12 We discussed today why the route choice is
13 important for Southern California and our state.

PH-LA1011-I
cont

PH-LA1012-I

PH-LA1012-1
cont

14 We're attempting to compare the two proposed routes
15 connecting Bakersfield to Los Angeles.

16 We believe Antelope Valley makes more sense
17 on all fronts; saves tax dollars in a time when the
18 state needs those dollars the most. It's easier to
19 build the route through the Antelope Valley.
20 Certainly reduces delay and cost overruns. It's
21 better for the environment and our air quality.

22 We also believe for Southern California, the
23 AV route addresses needs and connects important
24 population centers and encourages job growth, and
25 also helps relieve some of the traffic on some of

0069

1 the most congested highways in America.

2 It also would provide important connections
3 to regional airports. For all these compelling
4 reasons, the Antelope Valley route has won unanimous
5 support of Southern Californians, including the City
6 of L.A., County of Los Angeles, Los Angeles rural
7 airports, Southern California Association of
8 Governments, our own MTA, many other agencies.

9 You can see on the board it is quite
10 impressive the number of agencies that are behind
11 the Antelope Valley alignment, which we believe is
12 in the best interests of the entire state of
13 California, and certainly makes this project
14 something that will be backed by the people that
15 we're going to be asking to support this project.

16 So with that, I would like to say thank you
17 very much for allowing us this presentation.

18 We plan to give you more in-depth
19 information in writing in hopefully giving you what
20 you need to make the best choice.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Yeah. Just one --
23 when you make your comments, it is obviously a
24 positive to connect it to the airport in Palmdale.

25 But we also have, as an alternative, a

0070

1 connection to the LAX airport. And it's probably
2 one of the most expensive elements on this.

3 I would like whatever comments you can about
4 those alternatives.

5 HON. JIM LEDFORD: We think the connection
6 to the airport in Palmdale is something that's
7 relatively easy to do.

8 I believe that the City of Los Angeles, you
9 can find there's a lot of support to connect to
10 urban centers via Union Station, and I think we also
11 have plans right now to connect Union Station to
12 LAX.

13 So I think that this looks to be compatible
14 with existing planning efforts right now in
15 transportation, whether it be freeways or light
16 rail, heavy rail.

17 If you add it all up, we think the
18 Antelope Valley alignment is in compliance with

19 those existing plans. I think that's why you are
20 seeing the support from all these entities and
21 agencies throughout the state.

22 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Thank you.

23 Did you have any questions?

24 MR. ROD DIRIDON: I didn't, but do I now.

25 HON. JIM LEDFORD: Yes.

0071

1 MR. ROD DIRIDON: Mayor, thank you for being
2 with us.

3 First question is, would the stop - in your
4 vision, would the stop in Antelope Valley number
5 your downtown Palmdale area or at another location?

6 HON. JIM LEDFORD: I would think the stop at
7 the airport would be our best opportunity. It's to
8 create the stop at the airport and make it seamless
9 as we head up north to San Francisco.

10 MR. ROD DIRIDON: My second question, you
11 envision significant ridership for a system going
12 from Bakersfield north from -- pardon me. Not
13 Bakersfield. From Palmdale north, residents of
14 Palmdale going north?

15 HON. JIM LEDFORD: I think you are going to
16 find people throughout the state would want to take
17 advantage of the high-speed rail opportunity to go
18 throughout the state of opportunity, north and
19 south, yes, sir.

20 MR. ROD DIRIDON: Thank you.

21 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Thank you.

22 Next speaker is Elizabeth Warren, L.A. area
23 Chamber of Commerce.

24 ///

25 ///

0072

1 -TESTIMONY-

PH-LA1013

2 BY MS. ELIZABETH WARREN: Good afternoon,
3 Chairman Petrillo and board members. Thank you for
4 the opportunity to speak this afternoon at this
5 public hearing.

6 My name is Elizabeth Warren. I'm public
7 policy manager for transportation for the
8 Los Angeles area Chamber of Commerce. The L.A. area
9 Chamber is the voice for business in Southern
10 California.

11 And the one thing that we have always known
12 is that without a sound transportation program,
13 businesses will not succeed and the economy will not
14 flourish. Many businesses have left California in
15 recent years for different reasons.

16 But not being able to move goods or the
17 people who provide services within the region or
18 interregion, either by truck, car, plane, or train,
19 will ensure that businesses continue to keep looking
20 for greener pastures on the other side of the fence.

21 We have the opportunity to show the rest of
22 the country that the greener pastures are still on
23 our side of the fence here in California.

PH-LA1012-2

PH-LA1013-1

24 Anyone who is here today probably arrived by
25 airplane, automobile, bus or light rail. But if you
0073

1 came from Sacramento or San Francisco, your choices
2 were even fewer. You probably flew. Most people
3 don't have the time to make the drive.

4 Wouldn't it be nice to have more than one
5 option?

6 The L.A. area chamber has always been a
7 supporter of transportation projects that make sense
8 for California.

9 We have thoroughly reviewed the business
10 plan set forth by the California High-Speed Rail
11 Authority, and we are pleased to support this
12 program for the following reasons:

13 Number 1, invigorating force for the state's
14 economy.

15 What's not to like about this statement?

16 It would create more high-paying jobs for
17 Californians. The construction process alone would
18 create more than 300,000 job years for employment.
19 If we do the math, that's a lot of paychecks that
20 contribute to the state's economy.

21 Number 2, it returns twice as much financial
22 benefit to the state's citizens as it costs. This
23 project would generate at least \$900 million in
24 annual revenues, and return an annual operating
25 surplus of more than 300 million.

0074

1 Number 3, we have more choices, more fun,
2 and more productivity. High-speed trains will
3 absorb millions of travelers from airports for inner
4 city travel making travel, once again, fun and not a
5 dreaded event.

6 Who looks forward to the hustle of today's
7 travel?

8 Having a choice in your mode of interstate
9 travel is not an option that we enjoy today.

10 Three continued is reduced highway
11 congestion equals less accidents and air pollution.
12 Air quality is a very important issue in Southern
13 California, as in all over our state.

14 And congestion and air pollution are two of
15 the most important issues facing us every day as we
16 get into our cars. Getting out of our cars for that
17 three or four hour drive, or not having to spend
18 more time in the airport than you actually do in the
19 air might have a bigger benefit on all of us than we
20 dreamed it could.

21 And less time in freeway traffic jams means
22 more productivity. If you can get to where you are
23 going quicker, you will get more accomplished.

24 Even if that only means you are sitting
25 comfortable for two hours and you have a book to

0075

1 read and you are enjoying the scenery, you still
2 will be more relaxed and rested when you arrive and

PH-LA1013-1
cont

3 will be ready to hit the ground running.

4 This is the tip of the iceberg with regard
5 to the positive impact this program would have on
6 our individual regions and on our state as a whole.

7 We in the L.A. area chamber believe it's
8 time to have one voice in California, one voice that
9 says yes to high-speed rail.

10 Thank you for the opportunity to speak to
11 you on this issue. And we commend all of you for
12 your great work and what you're doing to bring
13 high-speed rail to California.

14 MS. DONNA ANDREWS: Thank you.

15 I have a comment. It's important that the
16 chamber takes a position on this issue.

17 As stated earlier, we're going to have
18 another public hearing on June 23, so we look
19 forward to you continue your support.

20 Has your chamber taken an official position,
21 or are you speaking on behalf of the committee?

22 MS. ELIZABETH WARREN: We have taken an
23 official position on the program in general, and we
24 do support the program.

25 MR. ROD DIRIDON: Madam chair, may I?

0076

1 The L.A. Chamber has shown great leadership
2 here. I don't believe another chamber has taken a
3 position in the state so far. At least we haven't
4 heard it.

5 MS. DONNA ANDREWS: Make sure Mr. Keifer
6 (phonetic) gets these comments.

7 MS. ELIZABETH WARREN: I will.

8 MR. ROD DIRIDON: I obviously agree with
9 your point of view and hope you might be able to
10 communicate to the other chambers up and down the
11 route, and so they might be more directly involved
12 as you are.

13 MS. ELIZABETH WARREN: At this board member.
14 I will be sure to do that.

15 MR. ROD DIRIDON: Thank you very much.

16 MS. ELIZABETH WARREN: Thank you.

17 MS. FRAN FLOREZ: Our next speaker is
18 Richard Marcus.

19

20

-TESTIMONY-

21 BY MR. RICHARD MARCUS: Good evening. I am
22 Richard Marcus, manager of long-range strategies at
23 the Orange County Transportation Authority.

24 Thank you for the opportunity to make a
25 preliminary statement regarding the draft program

0077

1 EIR/EIS with proposed high-speed rail train system.

2 Due to the fact that the board has not yet
3 taken a position on comments regarding the document,
4 I will not be testifying today on any substantial
5 matters in the document.

6 OCTA's comments are in the formative stage,
7 and staff are still analyzing comments for board

PH-LA1013-1
cont

PH-LA1014-1

8 review. We will be going to the subcommittee of our
9 board on April 19, and to the full OCTA board on May
10 10.

11 After the OCTA board has officially
12 commented on the document, OCTA will send it's
13 comments to the authority.

14 It should be noted that OCTA hosts a
15 Passenger Rail Technology Advisory Committee with
16 representatives of the jurisdictions including
17 Anaheim, Fullerton, Santa Ana, and Irvine.

18 This rail tack will take place Thursday.
19 Input and comments from local jurisdictions brought
20 up at this meeting will be included in the OCTA
21 staff report sent to the OCTA board.

22 OCTA is interested in continuing to analyze
23 the state high-speed train system and working with
24 the authority currently and in the future to
25 highlight the transportation needs and interests of
0078

1 Orange County whose 3 million-plus population make
2 up 8 percent of the state's population.

3 Finally, I've been informed that the board
4 of the authority will be back down in Southern
5 California in this June to hear further testimony.

6 At that time, I intend to give verbal
7 testimony that will echo written commits submitted
8 in May to the authority.

9 We continue to look forward to working with
10 the board. And thank you for your time.

11 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Thank you very much.
12 Ivrell Lazarona? Ivo Lazaroni (phonetic)?
13 Sheldon Walter?

14

15 -TESTIMONY-

PH-LA1015

16 BY MR. SHELDON WALTER: Good afternoon,
17 Mr. Chairman, members of the High-Speed Rail
18 Authority, my name is Sheldon Walter from North
19 Hollywood California.

20 I used to be active in the Mayor Tom
21 Bradley's Advisory Committee on Transportation, and
22 we were instrumental in getting rapid transit going
23 in this community.

24 I want to say that I think the program is
25 excellent. I think the sooner the better. We need
0079

1 this rail transit. We need this high-speed system.

2 I think the stop around the area in Antelope
3 Valley area is certainly important for reasons that
4 many people have spoken already on. I won't
5 elaborate on that. I think that's a good way to go.

6 And I am glad to see that you have a stop in
7 Burbank, which will serve a lot of people in the
8 area there.

9 We know that traffic congestion is getting
10 worse. We see that since the interchange of the
11 405, the San Diego Freeway, and the 101 Ventura
12 Freeway, is the worst in the world, or in the

PH-LA1014-1
cont

PH-LA1015-1

PH-LA1015-2

PH-LA1015-3

13 United States anyway. It's got the heaviest traffic
14 volume, and it's probably going to continue that
15 way.

16 The Ventura Freeway is one of the worst.
17 Seeing headlines in the "Daily News" about that
18 about a month ago.

19 Also, we see a lot of traffic congestion on
20 the Ventura Freeway, and there's been efforts to try
21 to improve that freeway so it would be able to
22 accommodate the traffic flow.

23 I think this high-speed program will even
24 help make it work better. I think I would like to
25 see this happen in my lifetime. I hope by the time
0080

1 I'm 100 years old, which I intend and am determined

2 to do, I will have a chance to ride on it. I'm in
3 my late '70s now, so let's keep going on it.

4 If any of you happen to have any connections
5 with Mr. Bill Gates, maybe he can help underwrite
6 some of the financing on it. I know it's going to
7 cost a lot. But we're going to have to scrape up
8 the funding somewhere.

9 Back in the 1970s, the manager at that time,
10 Jack Gillstrap (phonetic), said we need a rapid
11 transit in Los Angeles. And it was the largest city
12 in the world that had no rapid transit.

13 So I said, "Why do you ask me about that?"

14 He was the general manager, why didn't he
15 get the rapid transit?

16 So I said, "Well, maybe he thought I was a
17 millionaire."

18 So I looked around the room, where is
19 Mr. Howard Hughes?

20 Mr. Howard Hughes isn't in the audience, nor
21 is any of the leaders of his organization. So for
22 three minutes I presented a rapid transit for the
23 entire City of Los Angeles, and say, "You folks meet
24 with Howard Hughes. Maybe he can help you get it
25 going."
0081

1 So let's get going on this. And good luck
2 to you and the project.

3 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Thank you.

4 And if it only cost one-third of Mr. Gates'
5 fortune --

6 Joel Reynolds? Joel Reynolds?

7 Okay. Matthew Mackey?
8

9 -TESTIMONY-

PH-LA1016 10 BY MR. MATTHEW MACKEY: Good evening. I'm
11 just going to shoot from the hip here.

12 I live in Glendale. No special affiliation
13 or anything. I want to start off by giving you guys
14 a big thumbs up on this.

15 Someone that used to commute in New York for
16 several summers, the importance of rail is clear to

PH-LA1015-4

PH-LA1016-1

17 me, and I think it's starting to become clear to the
18 other residents.

19 The main concern, and many of my fears have
20 been allayed in listening to everyone else, is
21 sometimes large projects like this can become, for
22 lack of a better word, derailed by conflicting
23 interests, people in other organizations with
24 similar goals, but are conflicting, getting in the
25 way, and creating conflict that in the end slows

0082

1 down or completely stops.

2 So my general concern is making sure that
3 whatever atmosphere of cooperation that will help
4 see this through and get it done is fostered, and
5 you guys seem to be pretty good about listening to
6 everyone, and the document very clearly states that
7 you are trying to address everyone's concerns.

8 So having said that, I guess my big question
9 to you is please do whatever you can to help us help
10 you push this through and make it work.

11 If you run into trouble, whatever
12 organization you may run into, let us help you work
13 that out. Tell us what we need to do to make this
14 the Number 1 project in the state.

15 MR. ROD DIRIDON: Since you asked -- we
16 don't campaign from up here. But since you asked,
17 if the folks in L.A. seem so enthused about this
18 project, and we're impressed with the chamber's
19 comments and we had other information provided to us
20 by mail and e-mail and letter and telephone call, if
21 you were to put together some kind of coalition down
22 here so that you could speak through a coalition of
23 the broad-based organizations that will soon be
24 offering support, you probably would magnify your
25 impact.

0083

1 You might think of that that coalition
2 support organization in the area that could be
3 sponsored by the chamber or another organization
4 that has staffing.

5 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Let me add one thing
6 for everyone's information.

7 All of this work we are doing on a
8 \$30 billion project we are doing basically with two
9 full-time staff. Two. That's all.

10 Now, that's unconscionable in terms of the
11 workload on those people and our abilities to do
12 what needs to be done along your alignments.

13 And yet, I think it's a tribute to our staff
14 that they have been able to do as much as they can
15 with that level of staffing. And I'm sure they will
16 continue to do that, but this is a hard burden on
17 them year after year.

18 Just with the cooperation of the agency. If
19 you have one meeting with each agency, it's one day
20 out of the life of each one of those staff members,
21 and when you go from San Diego through Sacramento,

PH-LA1016-1
cont

22 there's almost nothing else that they would do.
23 That's all they do. And yet they manage to
24 do that and more. That's where we are right now.
25 MR. MATTHEW MACKEY: I expend my thanks to

0084

1 their efforts. Thank you.
2 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Mr. Arthur Golding?
3 Don Marten?
4

5 -TESTIMONY-

PH-LA1017

6 BY MR. DAN MARTEN: Good evening, Board.
7 My name is Dan Marten. I'm a resident of
8 California now for 20 years. And I live in the LAX
9 area of Los Angeles.

PH-LA1017-1

10 As a matter of fact, I live within walking
11 distance of Los Angeles International Airport. And
12 so many of my neighbors complain about the noise,
13 and I accept it as a fact of life. There's some
14 other benefits to be gained.

15 I'm also an aerospace engineer,
16 professionally, and an environmentalist. And the
17 most important for this particular setting is I'm a
18 rail enthusiast, and have been for a number of
19 years.

20 I remember back in the early '70s, working

21 with some legislators to advocate for doing
22 something to help Amtrak because I saw the benefit.

23 I lived in Europe for a couple years, and
24 recognized that rail was a major method of
25 transportation in Europe.

0085

1 And I have traveled on the Shincansin
2 (phonetic) in Japan and on the TGV in Europe and
3 France, and they're excellent modes of travel.

4 The points I would like to make -- the
5 first, I would like to suggest to keep the focus on
6 the main objective. And that is a high-speed inner
7 city connection. The emphasis on "high-speed" and
8 "inner city."

9 I recognize that all politics are local, and
10 it's important to keep the main objective. As the
11 previous speaker was saying, some of these projects
12 can be derailed by infighting and local
13 bureaucracies and such.

14 As a matter of fact, I was a supporter of
15 the high-speed rail commission back in the '80s, and
16 I know that there was some problems with a couple
17 inland empire localities. That was part of the
18 difficulty in making that project advance.

19 I was also at the Sacramento public hearings
20 on the high-speed rail authority. And there was
21 much about the local routing, especially in getting
22 between Modesto and San Francisco. And I know there
23 was a lot of intensity from some people about that.

24 I'm grateful not to see that level of
25 intensity here. I think the choices are a little

0086

1 more clear-cut for us here in Southern California,
2 at least between Bakersfield and Los Angeles.

3 I think there have been a lot of examples in
4 past history of getting distracted and failing to
5 keep focused on where we need to go.

6 I think, for example, in my neighborhood,
7 the Green Line and the Century Freeway that were
8 intended as an east-west connection, the end point,
9 however, was not quite dealt with appropriately.
10 And so the Green Line does not go to Los Angeles
11 International Airport.

12 It kind of stops out in the middle of
13 nowhere, it seems. It does a fish hook and stops.
14 It doesn't even go to the beach. You would think
15 you would choose your end points and actually get
16 there.

17 Century Freeway, pretty much the same thing.
18 It kind of peters out without a good connection.
19 And I can assure you on any weekend, the exit that
20 goes to Los Angeles International Airport is
21 overcrowded, and the tunnel under Sepulveda goes
22 under the runway is very crowded. And it was just
23 not adequately dealt with in terms of getting from
24 here to there.

25 If you consider, also, there's a State

0087

1 Highway 90 in our neighborhood, it has been
2 sometimes referred to as the Richard M. Nixon
3 Freeway. It goes really nowhere it. Stops short of
4 Marina del Rey and goes to the other side of the
5 405, but doesn't connect to anything.

6 Those are examples that we have of
7 transportation elements that are created that didn't
8 quite accomplish their job.

9 Thirty-five years ago I started as an
10 engineering student, and in civil engineering at the
11 time, and my adviser was a specialist in traffic
12 studies. And I remember one of the first principles
13 he drilled home. You identify your end points and
14 find the optimum route for getting between them.

15 I think we have some examples where that
16 hasn't been done. I would like to encourage to keep
17 the focus on the end points that we're trying to get
18 to. This is major inter city connection.

19 And I would emphasize Los Angeles and
20 San Francisco as major end pounds. It's great if we
21 can tie all four in, but I would keep the focus on
22 the Los Angeles to San Francisco route.

23 I-5 failed to connect San Francisco with
24 Southern California. A major north-south
25 thoroughfare for the state. As a matter of fact,

0088

1 for the entire United States from the Mexican border
2 to the Canadian border. But it missed the Bay Area.

3 And it contributes by doing so to part of
4 the Bay Area traffic problems, regional problem. I

PH-LA1017-I
cont

5 know a lot of people in Sacramento were concerned
6 about that regional traffic problem.

PH-LA1017-1
cont

7 I would like to emphasize to keep the focus
8 on Los Angeles to San Francisco.

9 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: You've run over your
10 time.

11 MR. DAN MARTEN: There were other opinions I
12 wanted to make about operating costs and don't let
13 the costs slow you down. If you don't keep the road
14 bed maintained, they will have to slow down the
15 trains. And we need to keep them high speed.

PH-LA1017-2

16 The other one is to protect the environment.
17 There's a lot of elements of the environment. And
18 what I see in the Environmental Impact Statement
19 looks okay, and I will give you more written
20 comments on that. But keep that in mind.

PH-LA1017-3

21 Thank you.

22 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Thank you very much.

23 Just to comment remember this is an
24 Environmental Impact Report. It's in general. We
25 will be following these up with -- when we get to

0089
1 the specific routes and ready to do that with
2 specific environmental impact reports, which will
3 deal with the literally inch-by-inch analysis that
4 the environmental impact reports deal with.

5 But we would appreciate, on the
6 environmental stuff, the gross aspect of it. We
7 still have to make a decision on whether we should
8 do high-speed rail, nothing, roads, and those are
9 the alternatives that really the EIR analyzes.

10 And we can't lose sight that we need
11 comments on that aspect as much as on the aspects
12 that everyone is all concerned about.

13 Will it go through my town or not go through
14 my town or go to this or that. We need to make that
15 as the initial decision.

16 Now, the Environmental Impact Report
17 indicates that high-speed rail is the way to go, but
18 until we make that decision and accepting the
19 Environmental Impact Report, that's part of the
20 analysis that we have to make and the final
21 decision.

22 So your comments on support for whatever
23 alternative will be significant.

24 The last speaker I have here is Daniel
25 Walker.

0090

PH-LA1018

1 -TESTIMONY-

2 BY MR. DANIEL WALKER: Good evening. My
3 name is Daniel Walker. Not officially representing
4 any group today. Just interested citizen from the
5 Los Angeles area. I also live near LAX.

PH-LA1018-1

6 Basically I'm a supporter of the high-speed
7 rail as a concept. I think there's some
8 deficiencies in the EIR that I plan to submit some
9 official comments to.

10 But overall, I think it's a great idea. I
11 think many of the speakers echoed my comments. In
12 particular, getting from here to LAX is one of my
13 main gripes.

14 I think the previous speaker highlighted the
15 deficiencies at the LAX end where the Green Line
16 delivers you a few miles from the terminals and you
17 have to take a shuttle bus through traffic.

18 Getting from here, you need to get on the
19 Red Line and go a couple stops down and go to the
20 Blue Line and transfer to the Green Line, and that's
21 before you get to the shuttle bus to LAX.

22 Many people don't do it. Frankly, most
23 people just drive there, and, you know, crowd the
24 roads and pollute our air because of it.

25 The MTA does, however, own a right of way
0091

1 between LAX and here. It's called the MTA Harbor
2 Subdivision. It's a little-used railroad route
3 right now. You get one train on it a day at most.

4 I noticed in your EIR, you propose that as a
5 potential high-speed corridor. I know some of the
6 residents might prefer this to be just a low-speed
7 connector.

8 That particular route crosses the Blue Line.
9 It also would cross the Green Line. It would be a
10 great connection to the South Bay and Green Line
11 stations, and a connection to LAX.

12 So Downtown L.A. to L.A. Airport connection
13 doesn't have to be a 200 miles per hour train going
14 through inner city neighborhoods. They probably
15 would not favor that.

16 But we talked to many members of Inglewood
17 that would prefer to see a light rail or some other
18 connector service that would link Downtown L.A. to
19 the poorer communities through Central L.A., and
20 also connect them to LAX.

21 We also see this as a good way to connect
22 the high-speed rail network to LAX. And that would
23 reduce the need to expand LAX.

24 Some people talked about the problem with
25 expanding airports, environmental impacts,

0092
1 communities don't like the noise, and the increased
2 plane usage.

3 But if you're going to Santa Barbara or
4 going to Modesto, Fresno, Bakersfield, if you land
5 at LAX, you got to wait for a connector flight,
6 which is hard to find.

7 It might make more sense to get on a train
8 and hop on the high-speed rail to get to your
9 destination that way. That way you have less impact
10 on the airport area. You get there more faster and
11 efficiently.

12 So there's a number of groups that I'm in
13 that are strongly advocating for this kind of
14 service between downtown L.A. and LAX.

PH-LA1018-1
cont

15 Overall, I agree you got to keep your eye on
16 the price. Let's not get derailed or defocused on
17 minor issues.

18 I know there's communities that have serious
19 environmental concerns, and those should be dealt
20 with. And there are many of them. And we will
21 follow-up with comments on those.

22 But I wouldn't put as high a priority
23 spending billions of dollars to just avoid one or
24 two highly concerned citizens where their issues are
25 not germane to the main point. Whether it is a

0093

1 perceived impact.

2 Let's get the project done, make it happen.
3 So I wish you guys the best of luck.

4 I hope we can vote on this soon. Maybe when
5 there's a good environment for voters to actually
6 approve it.

7 Let's make sure the project makes sense and
8 does have support of the local residents here in
9 Los Angeles.

10 Thank you very much.

11 MR. ROD DIRIDON: You asked me in the foray
12 area before we began about the Sierra Club position
13 on this.

14 I think you are a Sierra Club member?

15 MR. DANIEL WALKER: Yes.

16 MR. ROD DIRIDON: I promised to share this
17 with you. In 19 -- pardon me -- 2002, the Sierra
18 Club published this report in that period of time on
19 the 50 most environmentally appropriate construction
20 projects in the nation.

21 Ranked Number 3 -- and I will show this to
22 the reporter. Ranked Number 3 in the nation is the
23 California high-speed rail project, and I will read
24 the short thing here.

25 It says, "High-speed rail systems could go

0094

1 from San Francisco to Los Angeles and later extend
2 from San Diego. At speeds up to 220 miles an hour
3 with stations in -- airports reduce the need for
4 widening highways and expanding San Francisco and
5 Oakland airports, San Jose and San Francisco can
6 save costs for both rail systems that increase
7 connectivity between the state and regional bus and
8 rail systems.

9 "Funding to complete the current planning
10 process is needed to understand the impact and
11 feasibility of the future high-speed rail system."

12 It's interesting that here we have a strong
13 support statement from the Sierra Club in a short
14 period of time right after the Chamber of Commerce
15 declared their support statement.

16 You won't find many projects in the nation
17 that bring those two organizations together as
18 dramatically.

19 MR. DANIEL WALKER: It's a rarity indeed. I

PH-LA1018-1
cont

PH-LA1018-2

20 don't speak on behalf Sierra Club today. I know
21 there are many measures that certainly share the
22 viewpoint you read there.

23 I want to point out one other feature that
24 Los Angeles -- we talked a lot of about inner
25 connectivity. The gentleman before me mentioned

PH-LA1018-3

0095
1 systems that don't reach their destination.

2 It's interesting to point out that we have
3 over 50 MTA rail stations throughout Southern
4 California, and with the Pasadena line there's more
5 than that. And over 50 Metrolink stations spread
6 out throughout Southern California.

7 But the only one place where they come
8 together is here at L.A. Union Station. And I think
9 that's another deficiency in the system where the
10 various modes just don't quite reach each other.

11 The Green Line comes up about a mile and a
12 half two miles short of the Metrolink station in
13 Norwalk. They're both in Norwalk, but you need to
14 get a bus to connect between the two of them.

15 Those are projects that we think would be
16 beneficial with that \$1 billion in the bond fund
17 that would go toward additional connectivity. Even
18 if the system, the main trunk, goes L.A. to
19 San Francisco, but there's plenty other projects
20 that could connect.

PH-LA1018-4

21 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: That's part of the
22 purchase of the extra billion because the success of
23 the high-speed rail. High-speed rail is the
24 backbone of a transportation system. It's not the
25 entire transportation system. It works only if we

0096
1 have interconnections at each and every station
2 between all the regional transportation systems.

3 And that's a necessity for us to have a 21st
4 century transportation system in California.

5 Thank you very much for your comments.

6 Those are all the cards I have for personal
7 speakers.

8 Is there anyone else that wanted to speak?

9 I want to thank you all for coming, and we
10 are scheduled to be here till 9 o'clock --
11 8 o'clock.

12 Many of us will be leaving before 8:00, but
13 there will be people here to take whatever
14 information anyone coming late may have for us.

15 Thank you all for coming today.

16 MR. WILLIAM BROWN: My question is --

17 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Can you come to the
18 microphone, please.

19

20 -TESTIMONY-

21 BY MR. WILLIAM BROWN: My question is, are
22 you dedicating -- can we have -- I'm William Brown,
23 of Seaways Associates. We're a group of retired
24 aerospace engineers.

25

25 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Great.

0097

1 MR. WILLIAM BROWN: We are a study group,
2 unofficial, consisting of transportation groups in
3 Southern California.

4 My question is, are you dedicating the
5 high-speed rail system to passengers only? Or do
6 you intend to share it with freight traffic,
7 et cetera, and/or local traffics, trains, passenger,
8 whatever, or make it strictly long-line connections.

9 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: The very high-speed
10 portions of that, the very high-speed one, 220 miles
11 an hour will be dedicated tracks. That's the only
12 way we can get up to that sort of a speed. To
13 high-speed rail. And will include passengers and
14 high-value -- potential high-value freight, not
15 low-value freight.

16 In the other areas -- in the other areas
17 where we will be going at a slower speed, and there
18 are areas where we will be going at a slower speed
19 for any number of reasons, there may be sharing of
20 tracks and there may be other uses on that.

21 The reason for that is you don't have
22 high-speed rail, but you have, say, low-speed
23 freight coming on. And it ends up being the speed I
24 get is the speed of the slower, rather than the
25 speed of the fastest.

0098

1 So wherever we want to get to 220 miles an
2 hour, between stations, that has to be dedicated to
3 these types of trains.

4 In most cases, the other train uses will be
5 literally on the same right of way. It's not a
6 question of having so many different right of ways.
7 The choice along here is pretty much along wherever
8 we can along the existing right of ways of existing
9 train systems so the train systems will operate.

10 But every now and then, we will depart and,
11 in obvious high speed areas, will be separate.
12 We're not going to 200 miles, then we would have
13 different -- different criteria to look at.

14 MR. WILLIAM BROWN: In February a year ago,
15 a gentleman from the Alameda corridor explained how
16 they financed their system. And the corridor used
17 to pay for itself, basically carry the freight.

18 Have you considered use of the freight to
19 help finance this system?

20 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: We can't. Except for
21 what I call high-value freight can be carried on the
22 high-speed rail. Medicines and things like that
23 that have to go quickly. We can't, in the
24 high-speed corridors that's going extra fast speed
25 do freight also. That is for much slower

0099

1 transportation, and it's not the --

2 The Alameda corridor is not within the

PH-LA1019-1

PH-LA1019-2

3 intercity 30, 40, 50 miles between stops. It's a
4 design difference now.

5 MR. WILLIAM BROWN: In transportation
6 systems have expresses and locals that share tracks
7 there. I know it's a smaller scale than this.

8 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: That's hard to do
9 where we are going at 220. It is just a very
10 difficult design problem, and we looked at it and
11 decided that it just -- we couldn't figure out how
12 to make it work.

13 In other corridors where we have to go
14 slower, it would be -- and please, everyone should
15 be aware of that in most of the areas where we go
16 through, you will have a high-speed rail track, you
17 will have a -- two other tracks that will take
18 regular freight and passengers because the
19 high-speed rail will be built mostly within or next
20 to existing rail right of ways.

21 MR. ROD DIRIDON: But not on the same
22 tracks.

23 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: But not on the same
24 tracks.

25 MR. WILLIAM BROWN: Thank you.

0100

1 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Was there another
2 question?

3 MR. RICHARD MARCUS: You stated something
4 was to distinguish between the three options that
5 were laid out in the document, and are you aware of
6 the triangle of quality?

7 People talk about better, faster, cheaper?

8 Normally you can only get two sides of that
9 triangle. What you laid out in the document, and I
10 think it's reasonable high-speed rail gives you all
11 three sides.

12 You talk about something environmental that
13 is better. You talk about something that is as fast
14 or faster than the other available modes of transit,
15 and something that can be constructed and maintained
16 at a cheaper cost.

17 Maybe it's a no-brainer to me but --

18 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: That's the conclusion
19 in the environmental impact report. There might not
20 be that everybody agrees, and we would like their
21 comments if they think it's not faster, cheaper, and
22 better. And environmentally better.

23 And there are differences of opinion on
24 that. There are other people who think there's
25 better alternatives, and we ask them to comment so

0101

1 that we can evaluate that, to ultimately determine
2 what we think is best.

3 MR. RICHARD MARCUS: I just wanted to make
4 sure you know you don't usually get those three
5 benefits together.

6 MR. JOSEPH PETRILLO: Thank you very much.
7 (Whereupon, at 6:18 p.m. the Open House

PH-LA1019-3

PH-LA1020

PH-LA1020-1

PH-LA1020-1
cont

8 resumes.)
9 (Whereupon, at 7:00 p.m. the proceedings are
10 concluded.)

11 ***
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA) ss
2

3 I, Martin Spee, CSR 10303, do hereby declare:
4

5 That the foregoing 101 pages contain a full,
6 true and correct transcription of the proceedings.
7

8 I further declare that I have to interest in
9 the event of the action.
10

11 I declare under penalty of perjury under the
12 laws of the State of California that the foregoing
13 is true and correct.
14

15 WITNESS my hand this 24th day of April, 2004.
16
17
18
19
20

21 _____
22 Martin Spee, CSR 10303
23
24
25